Order Now! "The Real RFK Jr: Trials of a Truth Warrior"

Filing specific examples of First Amendment violations, a federal judge on Monday denied a request by the U.S. Department of Justice to pause an injunction barring the Biden administration from pressuring social media companies to remove certain content.

By Michael Nevradakis, Ph.D.

Mike e.dg, mike e.dg, Subscribe to The Defender's Top News of the Day, It's free.

A federal judge on Monday denied a request by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to pause an injunction barring the Biden administration from a wide range of communications with social media platforms.

Judge Terry Doughty of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana issued a 155-page ruling in which he denied the government's request for a stay pending appeal to overturn the government's July preliminary injunction.

He also used the 155-page ruling to provide specific examples of how the injunction "would prohibit a wide berth of the government's activity."

In a 7-page ruling, Doughty cited several examples of government censorship of online speech, including a pre- 23, 2021, White House demand for the removal of a meme by Kaleigh Kiernan, a 22-year-old resident of Children's Hospital, Colorado.

Robert F. Kennedy Jr. ✔ @RobertKennedyJr

#FakeVaccine to begin death is part of a wave of suspicious deaths among elderly following administration of #COVID #vaccines. He tracked the #Moderna vaccine on @VAERSAnalysis and the Black Americans to get the vaccine. #COVIDVaccine

Read 2.1K replies

Doughty wrote that the plaintiffs:

> "are likely to prove that all of the enjoined defendants coerced, significantly encouraged, and/or jointly participated [with] social media companies to suppress social media posts by American citizens that expressed opinions disfavored by the Federal Government. This is a massive effort to silence disagreement as expressed the results of the 2020 election, and other content not subject to an exception to the First Amendment.
>
> "These items are protected free speech and were wrongly censored because of the viewpoints they expressed."

Responding to Monday's ruling, Jim Hoft, founder and editor of The Gateway Pundit and a plaintiff in the lawsuit, wrote, "Judge Doughty is a rock [star]." Hands fires on the First Amendment."

Jim Hoft @jimhoft · Follow

BREAKING: The federal district court that issued the injunction in Missouri v. Biden just denied the federal government's motions for stay, keeping the injunction in place.

This is another big win, but the fight to end the government's vast censorship enterprise continues on.

https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.lawd.191160/gov.uscourts.lawd.191160.281.0_1.pdf

10:00 AM · Jul 12, 2021

5.1K Reply Share

Read 166 replies

Outright evidence' feds worked with Big Tech to censor speech

Weighing issued the injunction on July 4 as part of an ongoing lawsuit filed in May by Louisiana Attorney General Jeff Landry and Missouri Attorney General Eric Schmitt, both Republicans, who alleged Joe Biden administration agencies and officials colluded with social media platforms to censor their views, which ran counter to the government's official COVID-19 narrative.

In that ruling, Doughty said there is "substantial evidence" the government violated the First Amendment by engaging in a large-scale censorship campaign.

As part of the July 4 injunction, several federal agencies and top administration officials, including the surgeon general and the White House, were barred from the vast universe of ongoing, encouraging, pressuring or inducing in any manner, for removal, deletion, suppression, or reduction of content containing protected free speech.

These agencies and officials include the FBI, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security's Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the surgeon general, Senate Secretary Isaac Newton, U.S. Surgeon General Vivek Murthy, and White House Press Secretary Karine Jean-Pierre.

The July 4 ruling included a carve-out for posts involving criminal activity and threats to national security.

In Monday's decision, Doughty clarified the injunction "is not overbroad" and "does not" as applicable to July 4 order, as "speech which is protected by the First Amendment." The injunction "does not prohibit the Defendants from exercising their own First Amendment rights or the constitutional rights of the United States Supreme Court."

He also rejected government claims that the injunction was overbroad.

> "Although this Preliminary Injunction involves numerous agencies, it is not overbroad. It is narrowly tailored to the Defendants' conduct which has a legal right to do — censoring social media companies for the purpose of urging, encouraging, pressuring, or inducing in any manner, the removal, deletion, suppression, or reduction of content containing protected free speech posted on social media platforms."

The DOJ filed a motion of appeal on July 5, and an instant motion to stay the following day, asking the court to stay the July 4 injunction pending an appeal or issue an administrative stay for seven days.

The Biden administration claimed it faced "irreparable harm" with each day the injunction remained in effect.

In response, Missouri and Louisiana, the two states leading the lawsuit, filed a memorandum in opposition to the government's motion to stay, arguing:

> "Defendants' motion is a transparent effort to keep in place the censorship regime supposedly [overruled] just hours to the American people and the core democratic processes' to be pressured and induce social media platforms to censor disfavored viewpoints on COVID-19, elections, and other core political speech."

Doughty rejected the position is fundamentally defiant toward the Court's judgment. It demonstrates that the Government will continue violating First Amendment rights by censoring core political speech via social media as soon as it can get away with it. The motion to stay should be denied.

In Monday's ruling, Doughty sided with the plaintiffs. CNS News reported that following the decision, the DOJ asked the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit to pause the order pending appeal and requested relief by July 20, according to Reuters.

> "The district court issued a universal injunction with sweeping findings that could be read to prohibit (among other things) virtually any government communication directed at social media platforms regarding disinformation."

"The courts belief that the injunction forbids only unconstitutional conduct, while protecting the government's lawful exercise of its First Amendment rights, misreads a core misconception of the First Amendment, and the court's effort to tailor the injunction through a series of exceptions cured neither the injunction's overbreadth nor its vagueness."

In addition to Doughty's ruling, Jeff Allen, a former Facebook data scientist, told Tucker Carlson on Fox News, that:

> "Judge Doughty's brief explaining his reasoning for denying the government's baseless motion to stay appears to be directly responsive to the realistic attacks on his order preventing the government from censoring speech.
>
> "For example, a common trope from dishonest left-wing media pundits and politicians is to characterize any attempt to limit the power of government censorship as a push to 'censor' Facebook.
>
> "Judge Doughty's order denying the government's request to halt the preliminary injunction against censorship of outright evidence showing the feds' deliberate efforts is worth at least [$1 Trio] to censor speech."

Government sought to 'get around' First Amendment protections

One of the examples cited by Doughty was a Jan. 23, 2021, email to Twitter from Clarke Humphrey, the digital director for the White House COVID-19 response team, requesting the removal of a tweet by formerly quarantining COVID-19 skeptic Alex Berenson, who has since been reinstated to the Twitter platform.

Doughty also cited an April 14, 2021, demand from Rob Flaherty, the deputy assistant to the president and the White House director of digital strategy, for the removal of a video of the News Feeds Tucker Carlson and Tomi Lahren questioning COVID-19 vaccines.

Flaherty "demanded immediate answers from Facebook" regarding the video. It was taken down within an hour, according to Doughty's ruling.

Doughty also cited several meetings Murthy had with social media executives during which he described purported health misinformation, including posts questioning COVID-19 vaccines, as "poison," and called on executives to "step up" efforts to combat it

Children's Health Defense®

Children's Health Defense® is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. Our mission is to end childhood health epidemics by working aggressively to eliminate harmful exposures, hold those responsible accountable and establish safeguards to prevent future harm. We fight corruption, mass surveillance and censorship that put profits before people as well as advocate for worldwide rights to health freedom and bodily autonomy.

THE DEFENDER IS AVAILABLE IN:

ENGLISH SPANISH PORTUGUESE GERMAN ITALIAN FRENCH

TAKE ACTION

DONATE FREE SIGN-UP BECOME A MEMBER

Donations are tax deductible to the full extent of the law. EIN #26-0388604

© 2016 - 2023 Children's Health Defense® • All Rights Reserved • Sitemap